

EXHIBIT A

Return Date: No return date scheduled
Hearing Date: 6/28/2019 10:00 AM - 10:00 AM
Courtroom Number: 2302
Location: District 1 Court
Cook County, IL

FILED
3/1/2019 10:04 AM
DOROTHY BROWN
CIRCUIT CLERK
COOK COUNTY, IL
2019CH02668

FILED DATE: 3/1/2019 10:04 AM 2019CH02668

2120 - Served 2121 - Served
2220 - Not Served 2221 - Not Served
2320 - Served By Mail 2321 - Served By Mail
2420 - Served By Publication 2421 - Served By Publication
Summons - Alias Summons

(08/01/18) CCG 0001 A

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

SONIA LOPEZ-MCNEAR

(Name all parties)

v.

Case No. 2019 CH 02668

SUPERIOR HEALTH LINENS, LLC

SUMMONS ALIAS SUMMONS

To each Defendant:

YOU ARE SUMMONED and required to file an answer to the complaint in this case, a copy of which is hereto attached, or otherwise file your appearance and pay the required fee within thirty (30) days after service of this Summons, not counting the day of service. To file your answer or appearance you need access to the internet. Please visit www.cookcountyclerkofcourt.org to initiate this process. Kiosks with internet access are available at all Clerk's Office locations. Please refer to the last page of this document for location information.

If you fail to do so, a judgment by default may be entered against you for the relief requested in the complaint.

To the Officer:

This Summons must be returned by the officer or other person to whom it was given for service, with endorsement of service and fees, if any, immediately after service. If service cannot be made, this Summons shall be returned so endorsed. This Summons may not be served later than thirty (30) days after its date.

Dorothy Brown, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois

cookcountyclerkofcourt.org

Page 1 of 3

Summons - Alias Summons

(08/01/18) CCG 0001 B

E-filing is now mandatory for documents in civil cases with limited exemptions. To e-file, you must first create an account with an e-filing service provider. Visit <http://efile.illinoiscourts.gov/service-providers.htm> to learn more and to select a service provider. If you need additional help or have trouble e-filing, visit <http://www.illinoiscourts.gov/FAQ/gethelp.asp>, or talk with your local circuit clerk's office.

Atty. No.: 62075

Witness: 3/1/2019 10:04 AM DOROTHY BROWN

Atty Name: J. Eli Wade-Scott

Atty. for: Plaintiff

Address: 350 North LaSalle Street, 14th Floor

City: Chicago

State: IL Zip: 60654

Telephone: 312-242-0859

Primary Email: ewadescott@edelson.com



Date of Service: _____
(To be inserted by officer on copy left with
Defendant or other person):

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY OFFICE LOCATIONS

- Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington
Chicago, IL 60602
- District 2 - Skokie
5600 Old Orchard Rd
Skokie, IL 60077
- District 3 - Rolling Meadows
2121 Euclid
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
- District 4 - Maywood
1500 Maybrook Ave
Maywood, IL 60153
- District 5 - Bridgeview
10220 S 76th Ave
Bridgeview, IL 60455
- District 6 - Markham
16501 S Kedzie Pkwy
Markham, IL 60428
- Domestic Violence Court
555 W Harrison
Chicago, IL 60607
- Juvenile Center Building
2245 W Ogden Ave, Rm 13
Chicago, IL 60602
- Criminal Court Building
2650 S California Ave, Rm 526
Chicago, IL 60608
- Domestic Relations Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 802
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- Civil Appeals
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 801
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- Criminal Department
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 1006
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- County Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 1202
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- Probate Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 1202
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- Law Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 801
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- Traffic Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Lower Level
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm

Daley Center Divisions/Departments

- Civil Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 601
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
- Chancery Division
Richard J Daley Center
50 W Washington, Rm 802
Chicago, IL 60602
Hours: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm

Dorothy Brown, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois

cookcountyclerkofcourt.org

12-Person Jury

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, CHANCERY DIVISION**

SONIA LOPEZ-MCNEAR, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Case No.: 2019CH02668

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPERIOR HEALTH LINENS, LLC, a
Wisconsin limited liability company,

Hearing Date: 6/28/2019 10:00 AM - 10:00 AM
Courtroom Number: 2302
Location: District 1 Court
Cook County, IL

Defendant,

and,

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING, INC., a
Delaware corporation,

FILED
2/28/2019 12:26 PM
DOROTHY BROWN
CIRCUIT CLERK
COOK COUNTY, IL
2019CH02668

Respondent In Discovery,

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Sonia Lopez-McNear brings this Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial against Superior Health Linens, LLC (“SHL”) to put a stop to its unlawful collection, use, and storage of Plaintiff’s and the putative Class members’ sensitive biometric data. Plaintiff, for her Class Action Complaint, alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own acts and experiences and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Defendant SHL provides linens and other textiles to the health care industry in the Midwest, including in Illinois.
2. When employees first begin their jobs at SHL, they are required to scan their handprint in its biometric time tracking system as a means of authentication, instead of using key fobs or other identification cards.
3. While there are tremendous benefits to using biometric time clocks in the

workplace, there are also serious risks. Unlike key fobs or identification cards—which can be changed or replaced if stolen or compromised—handprints are unique, permanent biometric identifiers associated with the employee. This exposes employees to serious and irreversible privacy risks. For example, if a database housing biometric information is hacked, breached, or otherwise exposed, employees have no means by which to prevent identity theft and unauthorized tracking.

4. Recognizing the need to protect its citizens from situations like these, Illinois enacted the Biometric Information Privacy Act, 740 ILCS 14/1, *et seq.* (“BIPA”), specifically to regulate companies that collect and store Illinois citizens’ biometrics, such as handprints.

5. Despite this law, SHL disregards its employees’ statutorily protected privacy rights and unlawfully collects, stores, and uses their biometric data in violation of the BIPA. Specifically, SHL has violated (and continues to violate) the BIPA because it did not:

- Properly inform Plaintiff and the Class members in writing of the specific purpose and length of time for which their handprints were being collected, stored, and used, as required by the BIPA;
- Provide a publicly available retention schedule and guidelines for permanently destroying Plaintiff’s and the Class’s handprints, as required by the BIPA; nor
- Receive a written release from Plaintiff or the members of the Class to collect, capture, or otherwise obtain their handprints, as required by the BIPA.

6. Accordingly, this Complaint seeks an order: (i) declaring that Defendant’s conduct violates the BIPA; (ii) requiring Defendant to cease the unlawful activities discussed herein; and (iii) awarding liquidated damages to Plaintiff and the proposed Class.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff Sonia Lopez-McNear is a natural person and citizen of the State of Illinois.

8. Defendant Super Health Linens, LLC is a limited liability company organized and

existing under the laws of the State of Wisconsin with its principal place of business at 1160 Pierson Drive, Batavia, Illinois 60510.

9. Respondent In Discovery Automatic Data Processing, Inc. ("ADP") provides Defendant SHL with human resource management software and services, including employee time tracking services. As such, Plaintiff has a good faith basis to believe that ADP possesses information essential to determine proper additional defendants in this action. For instance, Plaintiff believes ADP possesses information that can identify additional individuals or entities that may have collected, used, and stored Plaintiff's and the putative Class members' biometric information.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-209 because Defendant conducts business transactions in Illinois, operates its business in Illinois, and has committed tortious acts in Illinois.

11. Venue is proper in Cook County because Defendant has had its registered offices in Cook County.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. The Biometric Information Privacy Act.

12. In the early 2000's, major national corporations started using Chicago and other locations in Illinois to test "new [consumer] applications of biometric-facilitated financial transactions, including finger-scan technologies at grocery stores, gas stations, and school cafeterias." 740 ILCS 14/5(b). Given its relative infancy, an overwhelming portion of the public became weary of this then-growing, yet unregulated technology. *See* 740 ILCS 14/5.

13. In late 2007, a biometrics company called Pay By Touch—which provided major retailers throughout the State of Illinois with fingerprint scanners to facilitate consumer

transactions—filed for bankruptcy. That bankruptcy was alarming to the Illinois Legislature because suddenly there was a serious risk that millions of fingerprint records—which, are unique biometric identifiers, can be linked to people’s sensitive financial and personal data—could now be sold, distributed, or otherwise shared through the bankruptcy proceedings without adequate protections for Illinois citizens. The bankruptcy also highlighted the fact that most consumers who had used that company’s fingerprint scanners were completely unaware that the scanners were not actually transmitting fingerprint data to the retailer who deployed the scanner, but rather to the now-bankrupt company, and that their unique biometric identifiers could now be sold to unknown third parties.

14. Recognizing the “very serious need [for] protections for the citizens of Illinois when it [came to their] biometric information,” Illinois enacted the BIPA in 2008. *See* Illinois House Transcript, 2008 Reg. Sess. No. 276; 740 ILCS 14/5.

15. The BIPA is an informed consent statute which achieves its goal by making it unlawful for a company to, among other things, “collect, capture, purchase, receive through trade, or otherwise obtain a person’s or a customer’s biometric identifiers or biometric information, unless it *first*:

- (1) informs the subject . . . in writing that a biometric identifier or biometric information is being collected or stored;
- (2) informs the subject . . . in writing of the specific purpose and length of term for which a biometric identifier or biometric information is being collected, stored, and used; and
- (3) receives a written release executed by the subject of the biometric identifier or biometric information.

740 ILCS 14/15(b).

16. BIPA specifically applies to employees who work in the State of Illinois. BIPA defines a “written release” specifically “in the context of employment [as] a release executed by

an employee as a condition of employment.” 740 ILCS 14/10.

17. Biometric identifiers include retina and iris scans, voiceprints, fingerprints and face geometry, and—most importantly here—scans of hand. *See* 740 ILCS 14/10. Biometric information is separately defined to include any information based on an individual’s biometric identifier that is used to identify an individual. *See id.*

18. The BIPA also establishes standards for how employers must handle Illinois employees’ biometric identifiers and biometric information. *See* 740 ILCS 14/15(c)–(d). For instance, the BIPA requires companies to develop and comply with a written policy—made available to the public—establishing a retention schedule and guidelines for permanently destroying biometric identifiers and biometric information when the initial purpose for collecting such identifiers or information has been satisfied or within three years of the individual’s last interaction with the company, whichever occurs first. 740 ILCS 14/15(a).

19. Ultimately, the BIPA is simply an informed consent statute. Its narrowly tailored provisions place no absolute bar on the collection, sending, transmitting or communicating of biometric data. For example, the BIPA does not limit what kinds of biometric data may be collected, sent, transmitted, or stored. Nor does the BIPA limit to whom biometric data may be collected, sent, transmitted, or stored. The BIPA simply mandates that entities wishing to engage in that conduct must make proper disclosures and implement certain reasonable safeguards.

II. Superior Health Linens Violates the Biometric Information Privacy Act.

20. By the time the BIPA passed through the Illinois Legislature in mid-2008, many companies who had experimented with using biometric data as an authentication method stopped doing so, at least for a time. That is because Pay By Touch’s bankruptcy, described in Section I above, was widely publicized and brought attention to consumers’ discomfort with the use of their biometric data.

21. Unfortunately, SHL specifically failed to adopt the retail industry's trend of not using biometrics. SHL continues to collect, store, and use its employees' biometric data in violation of the BIPA.

22. Specifically, when employees first begin work at SHL, they are required to have their hands scanned in order to enroll them in its handprint database.

23. SHL uses an employee time tracking system that requires employees to use their handprints as a means of authentication. Unlike a traditional time clock, employees have to use their scans of hand to "punch" in to or out of work.

24. SHL failed to inform its employees of the complete purposes for which it collects their sensitive biometric data or to whom the data is disclosed, if at all.

25. SHL similarly failed to provide its employees with a written, publicly available policy identifying its retention schedule, and guidelines for permanently destroying its employees' handprints when the initial purpose for collecting or obtaining their scans of hand is no longer relevant, as required by the BIPA. An employee who leaves the company does so without any knowledge of when their biometric identifiers will be removed from SHL's databases—or if they ever will be.

26. The Pay By Touch bankruptcy that catalyzed the passage of the BIPA highlights why conduct such as SHL—whose employees are aware that they are providing biometric identifiers but are not aware of to whom or the full extent of the reasons they are doing so—is so dangerous. That bankruptcy spurred Illinois citizens and legislators to realize a critical point: it is crucial for people to understand when providing biometric data who exactly is collecting it, who it will be transmitted to, for what purposes, and for how long. But SHL disregards these obligations, and instead unlawfully collects, stores, and uses its employees' biometric identifiers and information without proper consent.

Linens while residing in Illinois.

The following people are excluded from the Class: (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this action and members of their families; (2) Defendant, Defendant's subsidiaries, parents, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and its current or former officers and directors; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the Class; (4) persons whose claims in this matter have been finally adjudicated on the merits or otherwise released; (5) Plaintiff's counsel and Defendant's counsel; and (6) the legal representatives, successors, and assigns of any such excluded persons.

37. **Numerosity:** The exact number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, but it is clear that individual joinder is impracticable. Defendant has collected, captured, received, or otherwise obtained biometric identifiers or biometric information from at least hundreds of employees who fall into the definition of the Class. Ultimately, the Class members will be easily identified through Defendant's records.

38. **Commonality and Predominance:** There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of Plaintiff and the Class, and those questions predominate over any questions that may affect individual members of the Class. Common questions for the Class include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- a) whether Defendant collected, captured, or otherwise obtained Plaintiff's and the Class's biometric identifiers or biometric information;
- b) whether Defendant properly informed Plaintiff and the Class of its purposes for collecting, using, and storing their biometric identifiers or biometric information;
- c) whether Defendant obtained a written release (as defined in 740 ILCS 14/10) to collect, use, and store Plaintiff's and the Class's biometric identifiers or biometric information;
- d) whether Defendant has sold, leased, traded, or otherwise profited from Plaintiff's and the Class's biometric identifiers or biometric information;

- e) whether Defendant developed a written policy, made available to the public, establishing a retention schedule and guidelines for permanently destroying biometric identifiers and biometric information when the initial purpose for collecting or obtaining such identifiers or information has been satisfied or within three years of their last interaction, whichever occurs first;
- f) whether Defendant complies with any such written policy (if one exists);
- g) whether Defendant used Plaintiff's and the Class's scan of hand to identify them;
- h) whether the violations of the BIPA were committed negligently; and
- i) whether the violations of the BIPA were committed willfully.

39. **Adequate Representation:** Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class and has retained counsel competent and experienced in complex litigation and class actions. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to those of the Class, and Defendant has no defenses unique to Plaintiff. Plaintiff and her counsel are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Class, and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiff nor her counsel have any interest adverse to those of the other members of the Class.

40. **Appropriateness:** This class action is appropriate for certification because class proceedings are superior to all others available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy and joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable. The damages suffered by the individual members of the Class are likely to have been small relative to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex litigation necessitated by Defendant's wrongful conduct. Thus, it would be virtually impossible for the individual members of the Class to obtain effective relief from Defendant's misconduct. Even if members of the Class could sustain such individual litigation, it would not be preferable to a class action because individual litigation would increase the delay and expense to all parties due to the complex legal and factual controversies presented in their Complaint. By contrast, a class action presents far fewer

management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Economies of time, effort, and expense will be fostered and uniformity of decisions will be ensured.

CAUSE OF ACTION
Violation of 740 ILCS 14/1, *et seq.*
(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)

41. Plaintiff incorporate the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
42. The BIPA requires companies to obtain informed written consent from employees before acquiring their biometric data. Specifically, the BIPA makes it unlawful for any private entity to “collect, capture, purchase, receive through trade, or otherwise obtain a person’s or a customer’s biometric identifiers or biometric information, unless [the entity] first: (1) informs the subject . . . in writing that a biometric identifier or biometric information is being collected or stored; (2) informs the subject . . . in writing of the specific purpose and length of term for which a biometric identifier or biometric information is being collected, stored, and used; *and* (3) receives a written release executed by the subject of the biometric identifier or biometric information....” 740 ILCS 14/15(b) (emphasis added).
43. The BIPA also mandates that companies in possession of biometric data establish and maintain a satisfactory biometric data retention (and—importantly—deletion) policy. Specifically, those companies must: (i) make publicly available a written policy establishing a retention schedule and guidelines for permanent deletion of biometric data (*i.e.*, when the employment relationship ends); and (ii) actually adhere to that retention schedule and actually delete the biometric information. *See* 740 ILCS 14/15(a).
44. Unfortunately, SHL fails to comply with these BIPA mandates.
45. SHL is a limited liability company and thus qualifies as a “private entity” under the BIPA. *See* 740 ILCS 14/10.

46. Plaintiff and the Class are individuals who had their “biometric identifiers” collected by SHL (in the form of their scans of hand), as explained in detail in Section II. *See* 740 ILCS 14/10.

47. Plaintiff’s and the Class’s biometric identifiers or information based on those biometric identifiers were used to identify them, constituting “biometric information” as defined by the BIPA. *See* 740 ILCS 14/10.

48. SHL violated 740 ILCS 14/15(b)(3) by failing to obtain written releases from Plaintiff and the Class before it collected, used, and stored their biometric identifiers and biometric information.

49. SHL violated 740 ILCS 14/15(b)(1) by failing to inform Plaintiff and the Class in writing that their biometric identifiers and biometric information were being collected and stored.

50. SHL violated 740 ILCS 14/15(b)(2) by failing to inform Plaintiff and the Class in writing of the specific purpose and length of term for which their biometric identifiers or biometric information was being collected, stored, and used.

51. SHL violated 740 ILCS 14/15(a) by failing to publicly provide a retention schedule or guideline for permanently destroying its employees’ biometric identifiers and biometric information.

52. By collecting, storing, and using Plaintiff’s and the Class’s biometric identifiers and biometric information as described herein, SHL violated Plaintiff’s and the Class’s rights to privacy in their biometric identifiers or biometric information as set forth in the BIPA, 740 ILCS 14/1, *et seq.*

53. On behalf of herself and the Class, Plaintiff seeks: (1) injunctive and equitable relief as is necessary to protect the interests of the Plaintiff and the Class by requiring Defendant

to comply with the BIPA's requirements for the collection, storage, and use of biometric identifiers and biometric information as described herein; (2) liquidated damages of \$5,000 for each willful and/or reckless violation of BIPA pursuant to 740 ILCS 14/20(2) or, in the alternative, liquidated damages of \$1,000 for each negligent violation of BIPA pursuant to 740 ILCS 14/20(1); and (3) reasonable attorneys' fees and costs and expenses pursuant to 740 ILCS 14/20(3).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Sonia Lopez-McNear, on behalf of herself and the Class, respectfully request that the Court enter an Order:

- A. Certifying this case as a class action on behalf of the Class defined above, appointing Plaintiff Lopez-McNear as a representative of the Class, and appointing her counsel as Class Counsel;
- B. Declaring that Defendant's actions, as set out above, violate the BIPA;
- C. Awarding statutory damages of \$5,000 for *each* willful and/or reckless violation of BIPA pursuant to 740 ILCS 14/20(2) or, in the alternative, statutory damages of \$1,000 for *each* negligent violation of BIPA pursuant to 740 ILCS 14/20(1);
- D. Awarding injunctive and other equitable relief as is necessary to protect the interests of the Class, including an Order requiring Defendant to collect, store, and use biometric identifiers or biometric information in compliance with the BIPA;
- E. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class their reasonable litigation expenses and attorneys' fees;
- F. Awarding Plaintiff and the Class pre- and post-judgment interest, to the extent allowable; and
- G. Awarding such other and further relief as equity and justice may require.

JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demand a trial by jury for all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

SONIA LOPEZ-MCNEAR individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Dated: February 28, 2019

By: /s/ J. Eli Wade-Scott

One of Plaintiff's Attorneys

Benjamin H. Richman
brichman@edelson.com
J. Eli Wade-Scott
ewadescott@edelson.com
EDELSON PC
350 North LaSalle Street, 14th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Tel: 312.589.6370
Fax: 312.589.6378
Firm ID: 62075

David Fish
dfish@fishlawfirm.com
John Kunze
jkunze@fishlawfirm.com
THE FISH LAW FIRM, P.C.
200 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 123
Naperville, Illinois 60563
Tel: 630.355.7590
Fax: 630.778.0400
Firm ID: 44086